

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 27, 2008.

I. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 19, 24, 42, 47, and 65, and adds Claims 70-72 leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-72. Reconsideration of the Application and of the claims is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Objections and Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, 24, 28, 29, 38, 42, 47, 51, 52, 61, and 65 were objected to because of informalities. Specifically, Claims 1, 24, and 47 contains the limitations "the web service," "the protocol of the simplified message," and "the protocol for SOAP messages," which lack sufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, 24, 28, 29, 38, 42, 47, 51, 52, 61, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter with applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, and 19 were rejected for appearing to recite a mobile device comprising a memory and a processor, and the additional elements being the intended use of the mobile device, memory and processor.

Claims 1, 19, 24, 42, 47, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for containing the trademark or trade name SOAP and/or XML.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 24, and 47 have been amended to correct the informalities. The independent Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 19, 24, 42, 47, and 65 have also been amended to remove the trademarks or trade names. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, 24, 28, 29, 38, 42, 47, 51, 52, 61, and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0147850,

hereinafter Richards) in view of Jaworski (JAVA 1.1, Developer's Guide, Second Edition, hereinafter Jaworski), Glass (Web Services, Building Blocks for Distributed System, hereinafter Glass), and Kikinis (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0049833, hereinafter Kikinis).

Claim 1

Claim 1, as currently amended, defines the embodiment therein further including the features: the runtime environment program includes a relay interface, the relay interface knowing a transport protocol used by the mobile device and transmitting messages using the transport protocol; and the server includes a transport manager-relay interface plugin, the transport manager-relay interface plugin understanding the transport protocol used by the mobile device and receiving messages transmitted to it using the transport protocol.

Richards appears to describe a system providing information and knowledge sharing and tool for use with a mobile workforce wherein the system and tool automatically update data stored in a portable client device used by the mobile worker with data stored in a central database in an offline mode (Richards, paragraphs [0014]-[0017]). Jaworski appears to describe the Java programming language and the usage of it. Glass appears to describe Web Services. And Kikinis appears to describe a system using a proxy server to reduce the content of a requested web page such that the resulting reduced-content is suitable for a client device (Kikinis, Abstract).

However, it appears that none of the cited references discloses, teaches, or suggests the features of relay interface included in a runtime environment program running in a mobile device and a transport manager-relay interface plugin included in a server wherein both the relay interface and the transport manager-relay interface plugin understand the transport protocol used by the mobile device in communication with the server.

One of the advantages of above mentioned features is that an application can run on different mobile devices (i.e. cell phones that use different messaging systems) while having the runtime environment program deal with the specific details (such as the lower level message transfer protocol) of the mobile device. This way, it is not necessary to rewrite the application to specifically adapt to different mobile devices.

Based on the comments above, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 as amended is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references or the combination thereof. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 24 and 47

Claims 24 and 47 have been similarly amended to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 24 and 47 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 15, 28, 29, 38, 42, 51, 52, 61, and 65

Claims 5, 6, 15, 28, 29, 38, 42, 51, 52, 61, and 65 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 24, or 47 respectively. These claims have also been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Claims 5, 6, 15, 28, 29, 38, 42, 51, 52, 61, and 65 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from allowable independent claims, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims and the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5, 6, 15, 28, 29, 38, 42, 51, 52, 61, and 65 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Additional Amendments

Claim 70 has been newly added by the present Response. Applicants respectfully request that the new Claim 70 be included in the Application and consideration thereof.

Claim 70

New Claim 70 is substantially the same as the old Claim 1 as prior to this Response with amendments pertaining to meeting the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

New Claim 70 recites the feature: the server converts the simplified messages into messages of a first markup-language based messaging protocol for the web service and converts

messages of the first markup-language based messaging protocol from the web service into simplified messages for the mobile device.

In the Office Action mailed on October 27, 2008, the Examiner submitted that Kikinis teaches that the server converts the simplified messages to messages for the service and converts messages from the service into simplified messages for the mobile device wherein the protocol of the simplified messages is less complex than the protocol for the messages for the service (Office Action pages 5-6).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Kikinis discloses a proxy server that receives a first URL request from a hand-held unit, generates a second URL request to the web server serving the HTML page of the URL being requested, receives the HTML page content (including JPG image files) from the web server, converts (including reducing the size of images by converting them into dithered bitmaps) and reassembles the content of the HTML page into a HT-Lite (HTL) page for transfer back to the hand-held unit (Kikinis, paragraphs [0076]-[0080]).

However, mere reducing the content and transmission size of images of a HTML page is not the same as messaging protocol conversion. Kikinis's method and system do not appear to perform any conversion of messaging protocol, but rather reduce the content or data (lowering the quality of the content in some cases, i.e. images) to send to a client device in order to speed up data transmission. On the other hand the present invention does not reduce the content or the quality of messages.

Based on the comments above, applicant respectfully submits that Claims 70-72 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references or the combination thereof. Consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2008

By: /Sam Yip/
Sam Yip
Reg. No. 62,099

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800